

E

713

.A65

Anti-Imperialist League

Free America, Free China
Free Philippines.

Boston, 1901



Class _____

Book _____

PRESENTED BY

Anti-imperialist League
11 Boston

FREE AMERICA

FREE CUBA

FREE PHILIPPINES

368
370

ADDRESSES

AT

A MEETING IN FANEUIL HALL

SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1901

PUBLISHED BY

THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE

BOSTON

1901



E 713

A 65

CALL FOR THE MEETING

FREE AMERICA, FREE CUBA, FREE PHILIPPINES.

MEETING AT FANEUIL HALL,

SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 8 P.M.,

to protest against the imperial policies of the administration
at home and abroad.

Per order of the Executive Committee New England Anti-
Imperialist League.

ERVING WINSLOW,

Secretary.

Gift

Gen. W. Birney

N 2 '06



ADDRESSES.

COL. CHARLES R. CODMAN.

(*Presiding.*)

WE are here to-night to renew our vows to the cause of liberty and justice, and to the ideals of the Republic. We have no intention of giving up the contest upon which we have entered. Discouraging as the outlook may be for the moment, we have faith to believe in the ultimate triumph of the right in these United States. The great ideas of freedom, which are peculiarly American, have been challenged before now in our history, and before now they have been triumphantly vindicated. The truths of the Declaration of Independence are again attacked, and that "eternal vigilance, which is the price of liberty," is required and will be invoked to defend them. Hitherto, in all such contests, the party of liberty has triumphed, however protracted the contest may have been, and whatever checks and reverses may have retarded the result.

And so, I believe, it will be now; for above all the political duties that devolve upon the American people, there stands this highest duty, which is to be true to their own history, to their own fundamental principles of government, and to that moral law which is as binding upon nations as upon individual men.

It may be conceded that the present moment is not one which enables us to see clearly the end of this irrepressible conflict between right and wrong. Clouds and darkness are over us! To the superficial observer it might seem that a terrible indifference to the moral duty of the nation has settled upon the people. We seem to see it everywhere: in the street, in general society, in private conversation. The last thing that people want to talk about is the Philippine war, with its destruction of human life, its burnings of refined and of humble homes, its merciless cruelty, its list of Filipinos killed exceeding the list of Filipinos wounded five to one, the Spanish methods of Weyler used to suppress what our government is not

ashamed to call the insurrection of the Filipinos, who are fighting for the same independence for which our fathers fought — the wisest and best of the natives, the natural leaders of their people, deported to Guam, amidst the tears of their sorrowing families, who are left behind — the torture of the “water cure” inflicted upon Filipino prisoners by the Macabebe savages, who are now the allies of the United States, as they were formerly the allies of Spain, and from whom some of our own soldiers have, by their own confession, taken lessons in cruelty.

The American people are becoming ashamed of the whole miserable business. The foolish and reckless excitement of a year and a half ago is passing away. The people are thinking, and are asking themselves why it is that those who were our friends, and who aided us in the Spanish war, are now our enemies. Some of our fellow-citizens say that they want information. “Did not our officers,” they ask, “solicit the assistance of Aguinaldo and use him as an ally?” It is a pity that they did not seek information sooner. Had they done so they would have learned that the Filipinos became our enemies as soon as they understood that their independence was to be denied them by the United States government. It was the proclamation of the President — that was sent to General Otis in December, 1898, announcing that by the treaty with Spain — not then ratified — the Philippine islands had been ceded to the United States, and that the military rule of the United States would be extended over them immediately — that opened the eyes of the Philippine patriots. The war was inevitable when that proclamation was flung at these men, who were ready to fight and to die for their liberties.

When, in April, 1775, the soldiers of George the Third began their march from Boston to Lexington to seize the American stores at Concord, the king's war against American liberty had begun before ever a shot had been fired on Lexington green. When, in February, 1899, McKinley's proclamation was made public in Manila, the President's war against the liberty of the Philippine people had begun by the act of the President himself, and it matters not when or by whom the first shot was fired.

Think, my friends, for a moment how easily we might have had peace with the Philippine people! It was only to have said to them when, with their efficient aid, we had taken Manila, “We will treat you as we promised to treat the Cubans.” Not a hostile shot would have been

fired after such a declaration as that; and there would have been the same peace in Luzon that there has been in Cuba. The Filipinos would have believed our promise as the Cubans then believed it. They would have believed us, and they will believe us now, unless they hear too much of the administration's dealings with Cuba.

Is the administration going to make us false to our promise to Cuba? We have said to Cuba by the well-nigh unanimous declaration of our Congress that she is of right free and independent. We have promised, by the same unanimous declaration, that when the island is pacified we will leave its government and control to its people. Is it not pacified? Is there any disorder there? A peaceful constitutional convention, chosen freely by the Cuban people, has met; it has drawn up a constitution following the pattern of our own. Are we not, as an honorable nation, bound to leave the island as soon as we can get our troops out of it? And yet, as has happened before, the President is undertaking to impose conditions before doing his "plain duty." Cuba must promise never to contract any debts beyond her power to pay, and if she does so, in the opinion of the United States government, the United States must have the right to intervene. Cuba must agree to sell naval stations to the United States before the United States will keep its word. Cuba must agree, in short, not to be independent of that nation which, alone of all the powers of the earth, has declared that she is "of right free and independent."

Fellow-citizens! honest men! moral men! ministers of religion! teachers of youth! honorable men of business, whose word is as good as your bond! men who hate a lie! men who would submit to poverty or death before they would break their plighted word! are you going to sit still while *your* government, *your* political agents, *your* paid servants place your country in a position to excite the sneers of the haters of republican government, and the grief of honest and liberty-loving men everywhere? Do you want to be ashamed of your country? If not, then you had better call down your President. Before you realize it you may find some day that, like the Filipinos, the Cubans will think that their liberties are to be taken away after the Philippine fashion. Then perhaps there will be excitement on the island. Some patriots may be rash. Some Cubans, burning with the sense of injustice to themselves and their country, may not be able to curb their desire for liberty. There may then be con-

flict between the American soldiers and their former Cuban allies, and we shall have another ignoble war upon our hands, which the administration that has brought it on will call an "insurrection," and will ask us to "suppress."

One of our objects in meeting here to-night is to give information to anxious inquirers. We will continue the work of our League, we will spread the information we have over the country wherever it is asked for, and sometimes where it is not asked for. And we will trust our countrymen to do justice at last. We will not believe that when they stop to think, the American people will love prosperity better than honor; that they, whose liberty is their birthright, will suffer their agents to destroy the liberties of other men. We will not believe that the American people will always be deceived by the wretched and impious cant, that "destiny" leads us on to murder, and to rob of their country an intelligent and inoffensive people who were our friends and allies in the war with Spain. Do not, my fellow-citizens, be deceived by the false and weak pleas that are put forth by the advocates of imperialism and oppression. "The Filipinos shall have liberty," they say, "as much as is good for them, — as soon as they surrender to the United States all power to fight for liberty." "Give up all your arms," says the United States government, "and we will stop killing you. And, after that, — subject to the control of the United States, — you shall have such freedom as we think you are fit for." A people who will resist such insolent dictation as this from an antagonist of enormous power is as worthy of liberty as ever were the Swiss, or the Dutch, or the Americans.

I do not like to speak of the present situation as discouraging, but certainly it has no precedent in our history. The administration at Washington has at its command an army that may be raised to 100,000 men whenever the President wills it. It has money to supply that army, and it cannot be interfered with until Congress meets in December. Until then there is nothing to prevent the continuance of the Philippine war as long as the administration chooses to wage it; and when Congress meets, it may find that a Cuban war is superadded to it.

Nothing can or will stay its hand but the force of public opinion, and the friends of the administration will tell you that public opinion is on their side. They say, "Has not Mr. McKinley been reelected President by a

large majority, and does not that show that the people approve his course?" But there are those who voted for him who tell us that hundreds and thousands of voters supported him, though not approving his acts, from considerations of political necessity. I am not going to speak of any responsibility that such voters may have incurred; but this much can be said, I hope, without offence. We have the right to expect that such voters will use all their influence and power to stem the tide of materialism and of national dishonor. We have a right to ask, in this crisis, that every man who holds public office, or a position of public influence, shall show his colors, if he believes that freedom is in danger, and that a great national disgrace and misfortune is impending from the course of the administration which he helped to elect. Some of Mr. McKinley's supporters do stand openly for the ideals of the Republic, but how few they are! Is there any aspirant for office or holder of an office in Massachusetts, legislative, executive or judicial, state or national, who voted for McKinley, that will openly and manfully take his stand with Senator Hoar and Mr. McCall? Certainly none has yet done so. They may say in private that it is all very wrong, but will they take their political lives in their hands and say so to their fellow-citizens openly, bravely, and regardless of results to themselves? Perhaps they will, but let me say to them that they cannot afford to put off this avowal much longer. Or will they appeal to Mr. McKinley himself? He cannot be expected to listen to his opponents. He may perhaps listen to those who have supported him. Will they not move? What is it that paralyzes them — here in Massachusetts of all places in the world? Are all the Republican politicians in Massachusetts, except Senator Hoar and Mr. McCall, mere party managers, or party slaves? Are there no young men among them who will lead for liberty, as Sumner, and Andrew, and Wilson, and Boutwell did fifty years ago, casting "party" to the winds, when freedom was in danger? Thank heaven, Charles Sumner's successor in the Senate still stands for Sumner's ideas, though he may lack something of Sumner's power of moral indignation! And yet I would respectfully say to Senator Hoar, there seems to be a necessity here for some righteous indignation. It is not easy for plain men to believe that a statesman is really in earnest, who has nothing but soft words and flowery compliments for the perpetrators of — what that statesman himself has dem-

onstrated to be — crimes against liberty and national honor.

Fellow-citizens, these people of the East and West Indies are at our mercy. Neither Cubans nor Filipinos can successfully defend their liberties against the tremendous power of the United States, if we are determined to put forth that power. Sooner or later their resistance must cease. Their leaders will be captured like Aguinaldo, or deported like Mabini, or killed in battle; but let us remember that when we deprive other men of their freedom, we endanger our own. “Those who deny freedom to others,” said Abraham Lincoln, “deserve it not themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it.”

We — anti-imperialists — are ready to follow the lead of any public men, even if they have been supporters of the administration, who are now ready to demand such changes in its policy as will assure liberty and justice to the people of Cuba and the Philippines. But if they will not lead us or help us, we shall fight our battle alone. We can find in our own ranks men of “light and leading,” and we shall appeal to the great mass of the American people, who are sure to be with us when they understand, as some time they will understand, that in this contest is involved the future of democracy and of freedom.

THE HON. GEORGE S. BOUTWELL.

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN : This meeting, under the orders of the League, is a meeting for short speeches. I shall obey the orders. If it shall happen that to-morrow morning in any of the newspapers there shall appear as a speech of mine something that you do not hear to-night, you may attribute the extension to the reporters. I shall treat the speech as a New Hampshire farmer treated a speech made by Mr. Webster. When asked how he liked the speech, he said, "It wasn't much of a speech, but he said very much what I should myself have said."

I shall say of this speech : "If it shall appear to-morrow morning in an extended form, it is not much of a speech, but it is about what I should myself have said." Having introduced the reporters, I am disposed to say something of them. I began my acquaintance with reporters in 1842, when Thomas Gill was the reporter for the "Boston Post," when Buckingham reported for the "Courier," and when Hale, whether it was the Rev. Dr. Hale or one of his brothers, was also a reporter. Then came a long list of reporters. I have this to say of them in all sincerity : In all my experience with them I have never been in any important particular misrepresented or betrayed.

We are here to plead the cause of America. We are not pleading the cause of Cuba, or of Porto Rico, or of the Philippine islands, except as our success in redeeming America will secure justice for them. Hence our duty and our course of action are not changed by the seizure of Aguinaldo. ✓

We are here to make our protest against the policy of empire in America. This is the duty that rests upon us, and this duty must continue until a final judgment shall have been rendered by the American people. We sympathize with the struggling patriots of South Africa and the Philippines, and to-night we welcome a representative of the Philippine islands. ✓

The time is near when the third annual campaign of the war in the Philippine islands must be brought to a close, and the time has come when the people of the United States are justified in a review of the events of the

campaigns of 1899, 1900, and 1901. If, through the censorship of the telegraph and of the press, and the withholding of official papers from public knowledge, our means of information are limited, they are yet sufficient to justify an opinion upon the one important question: Is the administration of President McKinley worthy of the approval or does it deserve the condemnation of the country?

As a political question, his administration has been approved, but it is open, and it must ever remain open, for inquiry upon ethical grounds. The election of November, 1900, ended the contest over the presidency, but it did not end the contest over the war in the Philippine islands, nor did it check inquiry as to the wisdom of a public policy of which that war is but a symptom. That inquiry will not be brought to an end until history has ceased to command the thought of mankind.

From Republicans very largely, and from clergymen very generally, I am met with the statement that it was a mistake, or an error, or a misfortune that Dewey did not leave the bay of Manila when the Spanish fleet had been destroyed, coupled with the ejaculation: "But we are there, and what are we to do?" The question, "What are we to do?" is answered by the declaration of those who ask the question and who declare that the delay of Dewey was an error, or a mistake, or a public misfortune.

What is the teaching of the pulpit in regard to other wrongs and sins? Does it tolerate and advise continuance in the wrong until the sinner can escape from his entanglements without admitting his sins? If it was an error for Dewey to remain at Manila, when he had no knowledge that allies were to be betrayed; when he had no knowledge that ten million friendly natives were to be converted into earnest and vindictive enemies; when he could not have foreseen war, and that at the end of three years of war the only fruits would be desolated homes, stricken families, deserted fields, and barren acres; how much more ample and conclusive are the reasons for the abandonment of Manila when the betrayal of our allies has been followed by the loss of ten million friends; when two years of war and massacre have made peace through war impossible; when the augmentation of military forces is not followed by military successes; when the invading army is besieged and held in check by those whom it invades and seeks to oppress, and when proffers of friendship and peace have been rejected with menaces and

threats? And by whom? Not by Dewey, but by the President of the United States. On him the sole responsibility rests.

If lingering in Manila bay was only error in 1898, the act has been transformed into a series of criminal offences against public justice and common morality, beginning with the President's proclamation of Dec. 21, 1898, and consummated, or perhaps only apparently consummated, by the deportation of prisoners to desert islands or to foreign lands under orders of military chieftains who know no law but their own will, and whose security in the perpetration of a crime for which forgiveness has been denied in every civilized country was to be found in the quiet acquiescence of the chief magistrate of the first republic of the world.

Nor could Dewey, in the late spring of 1898, have foreseen the day, now fortunately reached, when the patriotism of the youth of America would refuse to accept military service in foreign lands for the suppression of the spirit of patriotism in a people entitled to freedom and self-government.

What is the next step in this career of delusion and folly and crime? We are to create a mercenary army to be employed in a war so offensive to American patriotism that American patriots will not engage in it. But by whom is payment to be made? By these same American patriots. And to whom? To the followers of Mahomet, to the slaves and serfs of the Sultan of Sulu, who is already our pensioned ally.

Where is the service to be performed, and against whom? In Luzon, in Cebu, in Panay, and against Christians, against republicans, against bodies of men who are already the supporters of schools, of colleges, of churches, and who are the unpurchased protectors of the domestic virtues.

Thus we are to employ bands of mercenaries for the subjugation of Christian republicans — mercenaries who will be animated, not only by the pay and favor that we may bestow upon them, but also by a fanaticism which has carried the religion of Mahomet over the continents of Asia and Africa. In this war of mercenaries we may expect scenes of horror such as have not been experienced since the early Christians perished in the catacombs or were slaughtered in the amphitheatres of ancient Rome.

Thus will be written a chapter in our annals of benevolent assimilation; or will mankind misread the chapter

and imagine it to be a chapter on malevolent dissimulation?

At the request of the secretary of war authority has been given for the enlistment of fifteen regiments of Filipinos for the suppression of the insurrection in the Philippine islands, and the secretary proposes to establish a school of discipline and morals wherein they are to be trained up or down to our ideas of civilized war. The proposition is instructive upon two points. It contains an admission that the patriotism of the youth of America declines service in the army of the East, and it is a confession that the mercenaries whom we are to employ are savages or barbarians. In the presence of this final fact, what remains of our claim that we are the representatives of a Christian civilization and that, although we are traversing the earth with arms in our hands, we are upon a mission of peace and good will, and for the advancement of mankind? We condemned the employment of Hessian mercenaries by Great Britain in our war for independence, and yet more bitterly did we condemn the employment of the savage Indians in our early frontier wars. And how different is the proposition of the secretary of war, which Congress has accepted and made a part of the policy of the country?

In his speech on the Jay treaty and in behalf of peace, Fisher Ames drew a picture of war as carried on by savage mercenaries. In his appeal to the representatives of the frontier States he said: "Your cruel dangers — your more cruel apprehensions — are soon to be renewed; the wounds yet unhealed are to be torn open again. In the daytime your path through the woods will be ambushed; the darkness of night will glitter with the blaze of your dwellings. You are a father — the blood of your sons shall fatten your cornfields; you are a mother — the warwhoop will wake the sleep of your cradle."

This picture, so drawn, and vivid with the imaginative genius of the great orator, finds a rival in the homely account which the soldier Jones has written of the wedding scene in the province of Santa Cruz, and which I shall read in the course of this address. The inevitable horrors of war degenerate into brutality when war becomes a war of retaliation such as we are now carrying on in the Philippines, or when war is waged through mercenaries, who have no country to defend, who are strangers to the sentiment of patriotism, and who, having taken up arms for hire against their own country, are

as well prepared for a career of crime as were the slave traders who hovered around the mouth of the Congo river or the pirates who terrorized the commerce of the Mediterranean sea at the beginning of the last century. Such are the recruits that we are to accept, and for whose conduct America is to become responsible. We are now to employ men to betray their own country, and we expect them to be faithful to us. From our experience in the attempts that have been made to organize civil governments by the aid of friendly natives, we have learned nothing. Again and again the commissions and the military authorities have been deceived and betrayed, but our confidence remains unimpaired, or, rather, it is the necessity of the situation that the army should be recruited in Asia, now that the supply of recruits in America is diminishing. Prosperity, so effective in securing votes, is the enemy of the recruiting service. It is not impossible that relief for the administration, in this particular, is near at hand. The war in China has destroyed our trade with that country, and our attempt to regulate the industrial policy of Russia may prostrate our own industries, and thus masses of laborers may be compelled to choose between idleness and poverty at home, and service in the army abroad.

With continuing prosperity, the demand for aid through mercenaries will become more and more pressing, and the conduct of the war in the Philippines will become more and more brutal.

In tracing the policy of the President I am led to ask these questions: How can a people organized as a nation become a world power, and how can a nation continue to be a world power? How is America to become a world power? These are the questions that have been thrust upon the country by President McKinley. It is assumed by the questions that previous to 1897 America did not have rank as a world power, and it may be assumed further that the President entered upon a policy which, in his opinion, would advance the country to that rank.

The wisdom of that policy, with reference to the end in view, I am now to consider. I shall assume also that the President's policy contemplates other results which, in his opinion, may be advantageous to himself or beneficial to the country. On two public occasions I have expressed the opinion that President McKinley is a very able man, and I follow him in his public policy upon that theory. Senator Hoar has put a very significant question in his

speech of April 17, 1900. The question is this, namely : “ Whether the inestimable and imperishable principles of human liberty are to be trampled down by the American republic, and whether its great bulwark and fortress, the American constitution, impregnable from without, is to be betrayed from within ? ”

This inquiry is without significance, unless it is an arraignment of President McKinley as the author of a policy by which the principles of human liberty are to be trampled down, and the constitution of the United States is to be betrayed. This is the gravest arraignment of President McKinley that has been made by any person in public life. Can the arraignment be justified upon the facts of President McKinley’s policy, and can he be held responsible for the existence of those facts ? Is President McKinley a responsible and intelligent betrayer of his country ?

It is now nearly twelve months since the interrogative accusation was made against the President. In these twelve months he has proclaimed in letters and speeches, and in his inaugural address, his adherence to the policy which the inquiry condemns. The policy of the President has not been changed.

There are, then, in this year 1901, firmer grounds on which the suggestive accusations of April, 1900, may rest, and graver reasons for apprehending the evils indicated by that inquiry.

Resting upon the opinion that President McKinley is a man of signal ability, I give him credit for capacity to comprehend the natural, the inevitable consequences of his policy as they have been set forth by Senator Hoar.

The President is supported by bodies of men who think his policy an erroneous policy, a dangerous policy, and who yet excuse him and tolerate him upon the ground that he is under bad influences from which he may in time escape. They who belittle the President and condemn his policy and yet submit themselves to his leadership, knowing that his policy means the overthrow of the Republic, and they who proclaim his greatness and condemn his policy while they continue to tolerate it and to give it support, are one and all and alike witnesses to his supremacy over them.

Do you expect me to advance a step and to indicate the motive under which the President is acting ? May there come a President with an overleaping ambition who will not be satisfied to see his name in the list and in rank

with Polk, and Pierce, and Buchanan, and Hayes? Even Johnson may be an historical personage when those whom I have mentioned shall be neglected, or shall have been forgotten utterly.

The President who can seize a republic of a century, of seventy-five million strong, born to an inheritance of freedom, of great principles in self-government, illustrated by worthy examples, and can build an empire on foundations so laid with possibilities not attained by Rome nor possessed by Britain, will have gained a place in history as permanent as that occupied by Washington, and such a President is already assured of the approval of no inconsiderable portion of mankind.

If you press me for a more definite answer to the question, What motive? I ask you this question as my answer: What vision of the future led Napoleon to carry the eagles of France under the "burning suns of Egypt and amid the wintry storms of Russia" and concealed from his eye the dismal outlook from the mid-ocean island of St. Helena?

An inquiry into the motives of the President may have more interest for the historian than for us.

I pass that topic, and I ask you to consider this question: Whether the measures of the President which are set before the country as measures designed to raise America to the rank of a world power are not in fact measures by which the republic has already taken on the characteristics of an empire, and whether the purposes of the President are not concealed in the phrase "world power"?

If there is a cardinal principle in the idea and in the organization of a republic by which it is distinguishable from a monarchy or an empire it must be found in this declaration: That the right to govern is in the man, and that the power to govern is not derivable from any other source whatsoever. An organized republican government must rest upon one or both of two conditions: First, the assent of the people expressed voluntarily and upon full opportunity, or, secondly, submissive assent to an existing form of government when there is an opportunity for protest and resistance. If that can be shown to be true which possibly is true, that no such government has ever existed, the fact cannot justify a people claiming to be republicans, in a policy by which they proceed to violate with deliberation and system, the ideal in government, which is the only security for the bettering of that which is.

That we have dealt unjustly with the Indians, that the emancipated negroes are not in the full enjoyment of their rights as American citizens, that women do not possess the right to vote, cannot justify our attempt to compel millions of human beings to submit unconditionally to our rule. The example of our own wrong-doings cannot be pleaded in justification of greater wrongs which we ourselves are committing.

In South Africa Dewet is teaching the world a new lesson in the art of war. Given a large territory and a considerable population, and the conquest of such a territory and such a people may become impossible. Large armies may traverse such a country; but conquest implies and requires occupation. If an invading army is to occupy a country, it must possess it in all its parts. The possession of the country requires a division of the invading forces, and when the invading forces are divided they are no longer movable, and when they become immovable they are as a city besieged. We have taught Aguinaldo and his successors a lesson that will be useful to him and to them, and expensive to us in succeeding campaigns. We have divided our army of 80,000 men into 400 parts, thus giving an average of 200 men in each station. Every station that may contain less than 1,000 men is exposed constantly to the attack of an overwhelming force. Thus may an army of 80,000, when divided into 400 parts, be terrorized and rendered powerless for any purpose except self-defence by the existence of 10 bodies of men of 2,000 each who are surrounded by friends, who would be warned of danger by friends, and who may move with freedom from point to point.

Such is the condition in the Philippines and in South Africa, and that condition will remain as long as the spirit of independence shall continue in the people. With this new lesson taught and learned England and America may wisely ask this question: When will the wars in South Africa and the Philippines come to an end? When you have exterminated the inhabitants or extinguished the love of liberty in the human breast, or when for us we undertake the task, that has not yet been attempted by any one, of demonstrating the validity of our claim to govern the inhabitants of the Philippine islands.

May a state indulge in acts and practices which are crimes in individuals and defend or excuse its doings upon the pretext that it lays its hands upon inferior persons, and exerts its controlling power over them, but for their

final good, sometimes in this world, and sometimes in another? This promise is never tendered by any but despots, and promises which despots tender are always violated. It was the excuse for slavery and the slave-trade. The barbarians of Africa were transferred to a land of Christian civilization and destined to great rewards in the hereafter.

Notwithstanding the pretexts that were offered in defence of the African slave-trade, the country, as early as the year 1808, abolished that system of "benevolent assimilation" and made its practice a capital offence. The African slave-trader bought men and women on the coast of Africa, and with the purpose of using their labor for his own benefit.

We have bought 10,000,000 men, women, and children in the islands of the Pacific seas, and we propose to so use and govern them that we can take whatever we may choose to take of the proceeds of their labor without consulting them as to the amount to be taken or the uses to which it is to be applied. How in ethics is our conduct distinguishable from the conduct of the slave-trader on the coast of Africa? "Ah," says the President, "we have a title through Spain. The slave-trader on the coast of Africa had no title to the men he brought away." In many cases he had a title derived from custom. Captives taken in war were held and sold as slaves. Such was the custom among the "tribes" — a custom recognized in ancient Rome. The title of Spain was founded upon a custom among nations in long gone by times, when civilization based on moral principles was not recognized. Even now it is assumed that the discovery of an island or a continent gives the discoverer, when a nation, the right to appropriate the territory and to rule the people. Such was the title of Spain to Cuba and the Philippines — a title which was trampled down when we wrested Cuba from the dominion of Spain.

Such is our title to the Philippine islands, if any title we have, and under that title we are exercising absolute power over 10,000,000 human beings, who have no legitimate, lawful, and systematic means of redress for any wrong that they may suffer from the officers and soldiers of the army of the United States. The friends of the administration make this answer: "We are to be trusted; nothing wrong will be done." Thus they open the inquiry into their conduct in the Philippine islands and elsewhere on which an opinion may be formed as to the value of the promises that are now made.

It appears from the returns that the Filipino losses in battle have been in the proportion of five slain for every person wounded. General MacArthur's report, covering ten months from Nov. 1, 1899, to Sept. 1, 1900, shows a loss of 268 Americans killed and 750 wounded, and a loss of 3,227 Filipinos killed and 694 wounded, or a ratio of nearly five to one. The experience in wars generally has been the reverse, the ratio being five wounded for every one slain in battle. Is it possible that in any one skirmish even the first shots were so fatal? What is the explanation? Does the fact indicate humanity, or does it justify a suspicion of brutality and murder? Could there have been such a destruction of human life in contests that deserve to be classed as honorable contests in an honorable war?

We are asking the Filipinos to accept our promises of justice in government, and what is the character of the evidence that we offer in support of our promises?

At the liberty congress held at Indianapolis in August, 1900, I read an account as given by a soldier of the massacre of a wedding party, and I now read it to you that you may consider the value of the President's promises when illustrated by the doings of his army. The letter that I am to read was written by Thomas Jones, a soldier in the Philippinean army, to his brother George Jones, an employé in a bakery in the city of Washington. The letter was printed in the "Washington Star." Hear what the soldier says:

"I have just returned from Santa Cruz from a two days' trip in the mountains. We left Santa Cruz about 4.30 on the morning of the 5th, and proceeded about thirty miles into the mountains. Men from each troop volunteered to walk five miles further to a house where, we were informed, a Filipino general lived. Beside sixty men we had two scouts to show us the way. We sneaked through the bushes from place to place, and when we had failed to find the house, or even see any natives, we became disgusted, and proceeded to return to Santa Cruz. Just as we were about to turn back we heard a sound of laughter near us, and we started ahead again, and, creeping through the bushes, we came in sight of a house. We saw a Filipino officer addressing a crowd of natives. In the house a wedding ceremony was being performed, an insurgent officer taking to himself a better half. During the speech the audience cried out: 'Long live Aguinaldo!' We were about twenty-five yards from the house when the word was given to charge, but not to shoot the children.

Most of the party had been indulging in wine, and were not sober. Each soldier took aim and rushed upon the crowd and fired. Those who escaped took refuge in the building. On the ground near the house were the bodies of the slain, and among them were the bridegroom and the bride, both weltering in their blood."

This statement was published in the city of Washington more than six months ago. I have watched the newspapers for the purpose of ascertaining if any notice had been taken of this outrage against humanity. Here were fifty or seventy-five persons, men, women, and children, innocent as far as was known of any offence against anybody, enjoying themselves in the most solemn ceremony of life, and sixty men belonging to the army of the United States, and commanded by an officer authorized to speak and act for the United States, discharged their muskets upon those men, women, and children, and the bridegroom and the bride were slain, and died weltering in their own blood. As far as we know no notice has been taken of that event. What is the character of that proceeding? Is it in accordance with any system of recognized government? Do you expect the friends and countrymen of those who suffered in that massacre to accept our promises of justice in government, if otherwise they would accept our rule?

I now read an account of the deportation of patriot Filipinos to the desert island of Guam by the order of the McKinley administration, through its military agents: "The scene was pathetic in the extreme. Many friends of the exiles feared to show their sympathy, and remained away, but wives, children, and sweethearts followed the ambulance to the wharf, weeping, shrieking, and tearing their hair in a frenzy of grief. Gray-headed women, mothers of some of the prisoners, ran barefooted in the dust of the road, tears streaming down their cheeks. General Pilar bore these partings bravely until ordered to go aboard. Then he, too, a veteran, wept. Some of the exiles wore insurgents' uniforms, but those of the higher ranks were mostly in civil dress. Just as the 'Rosecranz' was ready to leave, a Filipino, not an exile, was discovered in close consultation with his countrymen. He was arrested and sent ashore for investigation."

Following these brutalities of war, we are introduced to the President's policy of peace. The inhabitants are to be driven into the towns, and those who escape are thereafter liable to be shot as insurgents. The enforced assembling

of the population of a country in its cities portends death to the aged, to the sick, to the children, to the weak and the helpless, while the vigorous manhood of the community, who are the objects of the policy, are the last and the least of the sufferers. The reconcentrado policy is at the head of a class of crimes against humanity of which four may be mentioned: 1, the poisoning of family wells and the water supply of cities; 2, the derailment of passenger trains as a means of inflicting injury on corporations; 3, the overboard practices of the ocean slave traders when brought into distress; 4, the sacrifice by pirates of the crews of merchant vessels that had been seized. Thus has a policy of peace become more brutal than a policy of war.

I have had occasion to investigate the doings of the slave ships on the mid-ocean passage, but if more barbarous tragedies have been enacted on the waters of the Atlantic the knowledge of them has been concealed from the public.

It is an art of despotic governments, an art essential to the existence of despotic governments, that the facts on which public interest may centre shall be subordinated to circumstances as they may arise.

When the presidential election was pending, the country was assured that the life of the insurrection in the Philippines was in the anti-imperialists of America, and that the defeat of Mr. Bryan would be followed in 60 days with submission, peace, and happiness in the islands. The President made himself responsible for the first part of the statement. In October votes for Mr. McKinley were needed.

When the 60 days were ending votes were needed for the army bill. Fortunately for the administration, the condition of affairs in the islands was favorable to the policy at Washington, and Senator Sewell from the committee on military affairs was able to say in January that the insurrection had reached a height that it had not attained at any time previous. To be sure, the predictions of October had been falsified, the truth of the declaration of peace which was made at the opening of the new year had not been vindicated, but destiny had come to the aid of the President, and the reasons for the passage of the army bill could no longer be resisted by any except those who were prepared to disgrace the country by the abandonment of a contest in which we were engaged. The army bill has been passed, but insurrections are not sup-

pressed by army bills unless army bills are followed by recruits.

The debate, however, had been checkered by unwise remarks from friends of the administration. The war, they said, might last a year, two years, five years, or even fifty years. The inhabitants were more hostile and more united in their hostility than they were in February, 1899. This was an unfortunate programme on which to enlist recruits.

Happily by the first of February every incident was changed for the better. Destiny had again come to the relief of the administration.

It had been discovered that there were 90 tribes in the islands, and that 88 of them were friendly to the United States. The fact concealed was this: The population of the eighty and eight was less than a fourth of the population of the two. In March the President was able to give this assurance to the country: We have millions of friends in the Philippines to thousands of enemies. In this statement arithmetic forces us to accept this result. We have 10,000,000 friends in the Philippines and only 10,000 enemies. A formidable body of uncivilized men, however, who through two years have terrorized 10,000,000 natives and resisted, first 30,000, then 60,000, then 80,000 American soldiers.

We are giving a new lesson in freedom to our new "wards" in the system of civil government that we are about to set up in the Philippine islands. Law courts and trial by jury are abandoned. Thus two provisions of the constitution of the United States are disregarded, and if the constitution extends to the islands then the scheme is a violation of that instrument. Citizens of the United States are guaranteed a trial by jury in all criminal causes and in all civil suits in which the paltry sum of twenty dollars may be involved. An inhabitant of the islands cannot command trial by jury even when his life is at stake. His life is to depend upon the opinion of one judge, who can neither read, nor speak, nor understand the language which the accused speaks, and who is ignorant also of the customs of the country. Assume whatever of intelligence and good purposes we may choose to assume of the American judges who may be sent to the islands, we must also assume that the islanders will look upon them as enemies, as persecutors, as agents in a policy of despotism and injustice. For ourselves there is no excuse. For President McKinley there is no defence. When he

denies to the islanders, as his scheme of civil government does deny to them, the privilege of the writ of habeus corpus, the right of trial by jury, when he compels them to submit to the judgment of one man in all that relates to life, liberty, and property, can any ambition seek for greater power, or can any despot covet larger authority and rule?

The President's promises are for America, but in the presence of the practices under them they can only be derided in Asia.

If the inhabitants of the Philippines shall hear of our dealings with Cuba they will yet farther doubt the sincerity of the President, and they may come to doubt also the sincerity of Congress and of the people of the United States.

We commemorated the nineteenth of April, 1898, as a day of freedom in the annals of America, and on the twentieth we volunteered a tender of independence and unqualified sovereignty to Cuba, whose freedom from the dominion of Spain we had proclaimed. In that pledge of freedom to Cuba the President and the Congress united, and with the general approval of the American people. We are now redeeming that pledge, and by what process? We demand concessions that are inconsistent with our pledge of independence and sovereignty. Let me read the demands as made by the administration through General Wood on Washington's birthday anniversary, 1901.

First. No government organized under the constitution shall be deemed to have authority to enter upon any treaty or engagement with any foreign power which may tend to impair the independence of Cuba or confer upon any such power any special right or privilege without the consent of the United States.

Second. No government organized under the constitution shall have the power to assume or contract any public debt except to the capacity of the ordinary revenues of the island after defraying current expenses and paying interest.

Third. Upon the transfer of Cuba to the government organized under the constitution, Cuba consents that the United States shall retain the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a stable government, adequately protecting property and individual liberty, and discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba, imposed by the treaty of Paris upon

the United States, now assumed by the government of Cuba.

Fourth. All acts of the military government, and all rights acquired thereunder, shall be valid and shall be maintained and protected.

Fifth. To facilitate the performance by the United States of such duties as devolve under the foregoing provisions, and for its own defence, the United States may acquire and hold land for naval stations and maintain the same.

With these concessions yielded or extorted, will not Cuba have become a vassal state? By the first article its foreign trade will be in the hands of the United States. In the exercise of that power the United States may create or it may destroy industries; it may give value to labor or it may make labor valueless; it may enhance or it may cripple the resources of the country; and without much delay Cuba will be subjected to a Congress in which it will not be represented.

Thus will Cuba have been made powerless for valid negotiations abroad, and for defence at home. Next, Cuba cannot enter upon any expenditure in excess of its ordinary resources, without the consent of the United States. How are railways to be built, public buildings to be erected, water systems to be created; how are towns and cities to be lighted and drained; in fine, how is Cuba to possess the advantages of modern civilization if the power to create a debt is denied? The answer of the administration is always the same: The United States will do what is right. Do you doubt your own government? By the third article we reserve the right to intervene, whenever, in our opinion, the government is not stable, whenever liberty and property are not protected, or whenever, in our opinion, Cuban independence shall be threatened.

If such a power of supervision and intervention existed in our Congress over the States of this Union there would remain not even a shadow of that sovereignty which was once claimed for them. Under the third article the limits of the authority of the United States could be found only in the discretion of the government of the United States; in other words, in the policy and purposes of the party in power.

Under Article 5 the government of the United States may set up naval stations on any land that it may acquire. Under this provision it may acquire heights and other strategic points by which the cities and ports of the island

can be brought under our control. Thus and in this manner are we keeping our pledge of 1898 — a pledge of unconditional independence and full sovereignty to Cuba. Having thus violated the pledge that we made in April, 1898, the President may expect Cuba to accept as good coin his new promise that all these powers will be exercised in moderation, and that gratitude for what America has done for Cuba should be recognized by unlimited confidence in the good purposes of America. A member of the cabinet defends these encroachments upon the sovereignty of Cuba as an application of the Monroe doctrine. For the moment it is a satisfaction for me to believe that the profession of the law is in no wise responsible for that opinion. The Monroe doctrine was a declaration that the United States asserted the right to interfere in behalf of any American state whose sovereignty might be assailed by another power.

We announced a purpose to protect American states against the injustice we are now to practise on Cuba. The Monroe doctrine was designed to protect American states from the injustice which we are imposing upon an embryo state which is powerless to defend itself. Thus does the administration subvert a policy of freedom and sovereignty in states into a policy by which strong states may tyrannize over the weaker ones upon the pretext of aiding and defending them. And thus is the administration struggling to become a world power by alliances with the strong, as in the case of China, and by usurpations over the weak, as in Hawaii, Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines.

The policy of supremacy in Cuba may be, and probably it will be, a peril to the peace of the United States. For example, a protocol for a treaty of reciprocity between Cuba and Germany that should be disapproved by the United States might even end in war and an alliance between Cuba and Germany.

✓ Let us first of all perform our obligations to Cuba in their fulness, and then, by negotiations with Cuba, as a free, independent, and sovereign State, we may secure every concession that Cuba ought to make or that we ought to seek. No enforced concession from Cuba can compensate the American people for the wilful violation of the pledge of April, 1898. The purpose of the President is so well known that there can be no hope for the honor of America or for justice to Cuba if the conduct of the measure shall be left in his hands.

If the suggestion I am now to make has not had a lodgment in the mind of the President, I may aid him in case his attempt to subjugate the Philippines should become hopeless, although I shall not aid him in putting the scheme into execution. The demand has been made in Congress and in the country that the Philippines should be put upon the basis of Cuba. If the terms named can be imposed upon Cuba with the approval of Congress and the consent of the country the President may accept like terms for the Philippines. Thus, upon the theory of the President, the Republic will have been far advanced as a world power, and thus the Republic will have taken on, irretrievably taken on, all the characteristics of an empire.

I give the President credit for having contemplated all this as the outcome of the policy that he is pursuing. Thus the steps by which the President seeks to advance the country to the rank of a world power aid him in like degree in his ambition to create an empire on the foundations of the Republic. The President has never faltered in his purpose. We can now trace his policy step by step from the 19th of April, when by the declaration of war against Spain a way was opened for the execution of the ambitious designs of the President.

The protocol of the 10th of August was innocent of any purpose to demand the Philippines as an essential of peace. Next, he took security for the ratification of the treaty of Paris by the appointment of senators upon the commission who as senators were to pass upon their own work. If it had then been his purpose to limit the scope of the treaty to the fulfilment of the object for which the war was undertaken — the freedom of Cuba — the treaty without surreptitious aid would have been ratified by a unanimous Senate. If the scope of the treaty had been limited to the freedom of Cuba there would have been neither occasion nor opportunity nor inducement for a member of the commission to change his opinion upon the question of demanding from Spain the cession of the Philippines. Spain yielded to the demand only when the President made it the one condition of peace, a condition which could not be waived nor changed. The constitution of the commission is evidence conclusive that at that time the President had resolved upon the acquisition of the islands. On the 21st of December, 1898, when the treaty had not been ratified, the President issued his proclamation by which he assumed full jurisdiction over the islands, and demanded unconditional submission from the

people. This act on the part of the President precluded negotiations for the sovereignty and independence on the part of the native population. The proclamation assumed authority in one party and subserviency in the other party. From that day the Filipinos had only the choice between submission and war. By that act the President repudiated the relation of allies, and thus he became responsible for the war of February, 1899. When the war opened, and when time and events had not embittered the Filipino population, the President refused to listen to Aguinaldo's request for a cessation of hostilities. Thus the President refused a tender of peace, and thus he made the war inevitable. And for what purpose? He then and by that proclamation foreclosed to the Filipinos all chance for sovereignty and independence, and prepared the way for the enforced annexation of the Philippines to the United States. Thus we are growing into a world power, and thus we are passing from a republic to an empire.

Thus and by such means has the President gained control of the islands as far as it can be exercised and enjoyed through military power. His final victory is in the army bill by which he is authorized to govern the millions of the islands without any legal or constitutional restraint resting upon him.

From our example despotism itself in forms most feared may learn a new lesson in the art of ruling.

We entered China as one of the world powers for the protection of our minister. That purpose was accomplished many months ago, and yet we remain. Why? The President says the integrity of China ought not to be disturbed. In like manner he has said that our pledge to Cuba is to be kept. That pledge has been in his keeping, and with what result? Why does the President retain his hold upon Pekin? The answer must be this: As a world power we were of the allies that achieved the conquest of the city. If China is to be divided why should not the United States as a world power and as one of the allies take a share in the fruits of the conquest? By what authority did the President make war upon China, a nation with which we were at peace? Had he any purpose in view but the acquisition of more territory? And now that our minister is secure, and when the missionaries have had an opportunity to leave the country, can the President have any other motive for remaining at Pekin than greed of territory and lust for power? A fragment of our army

is to remain in Peking, but not to prevent a division of the empire, but to share in it, if division shall become inevitable.

I shall not continue the inquiry whether we are more or less a world power than we were in 1897, but of this I am assured: In 1897 we were a republic and in 1901 we are an empire. Mark the steps by which the change has been wrought. First in point of time we annexed Hawaii, a country that had been seized by a minority. In the system that we have there set up we have disfranchised a large body of those who had theretofore participated in the government, and we have made the possession of property a condition of holding office. Thus have we trampled down the doctrine of popular government and denied the equality of men.

We have secured from England and Germany exclusive jurisdiction of islands in the Samoan group, where we are engaged in keeping the peace by the presence of a naval force.

Porto Rico has been annexed unconditionally. In that island we have a civil government that has been created by the order of the President.

In disregard of our pledge of freedom and sovereignty to Cuba we are imposing on that island conditions of colonial vassalage. ✓

The Island of Guam has been made a penal colony and one person, whose name has become historical, has been deported by a military order without a trial and without an opportunity for defence.

Finally Congress has given the President full power to govern Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, and in none of these vast possessions can the people appeal either to the constitution or the laws of the United States.

Has power more unlimited been exercised by any despot in any age or country? We may not as yet doubt the disposition of the country to do what is right, but in these facts there is ground for denying to President McKinley the purpose to do what is right. The question is not, as the President would have the country believe, whether we can conquer the Philippine islands; the question is not whether we have power to make Cuba a vassal State; the question is this: Are we justified in the attempt to do either?

It is a boast of the President's inaugural address that we have become a world power and that we are taking a part in the affairs of the world, and boastfully he asks

this question : “ Are we to shrink in the presence of the great duty to which we are called ? ” In 1897 we were respected in all countries. We were not hated by the powerful states of the world nor feared by the weaker ones. Taxation was moderate, and the maximum of the army was only one-fourth of what it now is. The President says we are at peace with all the world, but the army and the navy are on a war footing, and the support of the army and navy has added 25. or 30 per cent. to our taxes.

The great Republic has become an object of fear to every other American state. They are witnesses to the seizure and they forecast the fate of Hawaii, Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines. We have made enemies of Russia and the Chinese Empire, the great markets of the future. Already our policy in the East has touched unfavorably our industries in America. The President boasts that the progress of America has been marked by beneficence and justice. Yes, but our strength has been in our example and not through force. Until now we have never attempted to compel existing communities into a state of pupilage and vassalage. We have waited until they were prepared to accept our ideas and system of government. In two instances we eradicated evils within our own recognized jurisdiction, but never previous to 1898 have we attempted to compel other people to accept our forms of goodness. We abolished slavery by force and we prohibited polygamy by law. Both, whether they are crimes or only evils, are tolerated and pensioned in the Philippine islands.

The President claims that he did all that in honor could be done to avert the war, but without avail. Thus he puts the responsibility for the war upon Congress. But Congress did not prepare the protocol ; Congress did not demand the surrender of the Philippines as a *sine qua non* of a treaty of peace ; Congress did not authorize the issue of the proclamation of Dec. 21, 1898, which made war in the Philippines inevitable ; Congress did not authorize the rejection with contumely of Aguinaldo's proffer of peace made in the early days of February, 1899 ; and above all, Congress did not authorize the invasion of China, a nation with which we were at peace.

The Republican party in Congress has ratified some of these doings and it has sanctioned all of them. The President and the Republican party are now alike responsible. No one can state an account current between the people of the United States and this war.

A few items on the debit side may be named :

Increased expenditures, \$500,000,000.

Increased taxation in a like sum.

A heavy pension roll that will run for half a century.

A loss of many thousand American citizens, who fell in battle or died in hospitals.

Other thousands who have been sent home insane or otherwise diseased.

Finally, the brutalizing of all who have participated in the war in the Philippines.

The administration can only file in set-off this altruistic proposition : We intend to carry to these people better ideas of life, better institutions of government, a better religion, whenever they shall be prepared to receive these great gifts submissively at our hands. For this end, an end manifestly uncertain, improbable indeed in the highest degree, the American people are sacrificing blood, and treasure, and the good name of the Republic throughout the world.

Shall the policy of President McKinley be continued? Or shall it be abandoned, and a policy of power through peace and justice be substituted for a policy of empire through war, conquest, and the enslavement of mankind?

If there has been any betrayal of the American constitution, if the principles of human liberty have been trampled down in these four years, the author is President McKinley, and for his conduct the Republican party has assumed full responsibility. What, then, is the remedy? My answer is this : The overthrow of President McKinley through the defeat of the Republican party. This accomplished, and the policy of aggression, of conquest, and of war will have come to an end. Decisions of the courts can be avoided. Wars can be waged, territories can be conquered, states can be seized, taxes can be imposed, debts can be created, and courts must remain silent as to all these undertakings. The policy must be interrupted, the policy must be reversed. Of relief through the Republican party there is no prospect—not the least, even. On the 17th of April, 1900, the party, as an organization, was not committed to the policy of empire. On the 4th of March, 1901, the Republican party was irretrievably bound by the policy of President McKinley, and to-day there are not twenty representative Republicans of official standing who dissent publicly from that policy. Hence, it is that the Republican party must be destroyed, and with its destruction the policy of empire will have come to an end.

Its successor, however organized, and by whatever name called, will be pledged to the unconditional freedom of Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines. And thus the Republic may come to live again through an experience that may have cost a thousand million dollars, and fifty or a hundred thousand American lives.

MR. GEORGE GLUYAS MERCER.

“WHEN liberty is in danger, Faneuil hall has the right, it is her duty, to strike the keynote for these United States.” These, citizens of Boston, were the words uttered in this hall by your son, Wendell Phillips, some three and sixty years ago, in the first speech he ever made here — a speech to be followed by many others made by the same champion of human freedom in this same sacred place. Two generations before that these walls had answered to the appeals of Revolutionary patriots, and in those days Philadelphia and Boston stood side by side in the struggle for independent self-government, and I deem it a high honor to-night to have the privilege of standing here to bring you greeting from Independence Hall.

It is my conviction that the fathers of our Republic proclaimed to the world not only a profound principle of political philosophy, but also a fundamental principle of social evolution, when they declared that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. All political and social progress since that time has been in accordance with that principle, and we are here to-night to demand that wherever our flag goes that principle shall go with it, to distinguish our republic from the empires of Europe. Governor Boutwell has adverted to the criticism sometimes made that we have not been faithful to that principle in the cases of women, and negroes, and Indians. As for the women, they give submissive assent to the present government. When they unite in demanding rights equal to those of men, which I, for one, believe they ought to have, they will get those rights. As for the negroes, our civil war lifted them to the plane of citizenship, and any attempt now made to deprive them of their constitutional rights is wrong. As for the Indians, our treatment of them has properly been called “a century of dishonor,” but we have never treated them as badly as we are now treating the Filipinos. We have recognized their nationality and made treaties with them, and have behaved toward them far more nobly than toward our former allies in Luzon. But granting that we have not done our duty in these cases, is that any argument for a continuance of the wrong-doing? Because a man breaks one commandment, shall he disregard the entire decalogue? “Be ye

therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." What did Christ mean by that? Not, I take it, that perfection was attainable by all, but rather that perfection was the ideal for which all should strive. When the American fathers declared that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, they set that up as a standard. They believed that the nation that did most toward reaching that standard would attain the nearest degree to political perfection. Prior to the Philippine war America kept ever before her this lofty ideal of the Declaration. As the years went by she succeeded in making the ideal more and more nearly real. Did the Constitution make an exception to the rule in its provision as to slavery? Are we always faithful to the principle to-day? As applied to the situation in the Philippines, I care not how these questions are answered. They are beside the mark. What we protest against is that the government has deliberately abandoned that ideal in the Philippines and set up another policy. This eighteenth century political philosophy which Jefferson embodied in the Declaration of Independence — is it true? Is it what Lincoln said its author meant it to be — "a stumbling-block to all those who in after times might seek to turn a free people back into the paths of despotism?" Is it still an ideal for twentieth-century America, freer and more prosperous than in the days of her youth? Or has plutocracy bred tyrants, and must we give up our ancient faith? I see there are some who still believe in the principle. We believe it the highest duty to strive to bring the Republic back to the ideals of her youth, and we shall not cease in our endeavor while life lasts.

When the administration first entered upon this imperialist policy the man who taught me political economy at Yale College, Prof. William G. Sumner, published an article entitled "The Conquest of the United States by Spain." Professor Sumner had no intention at that time of assuming the role of prophet. He meant merely to indicate that the administration had entered upon the path which had brought Spain to ruin. Subsequent events, however, have shown that no paper ever had a truer title. The Spanish conquest of our country has steadily continued. Beginning with the denial to the Filipinos of their independence, it has gone on step by step until the Filipinos have to-day toward us the same feeling of intense resentment that they formerly felt toward the Spaniards. We protested against the reconcentrado

method of a Spanish general who was called a butcher, in Cuba. We have adopted the same method in the Philippines. "He has transported us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offences." That was one of the counts in the indictment against George III. as made in our Declaration of Independence at Philadelphia. We have established a penal colony in Guam, and the most noted man to be banished is he whom Admiral Dewey calls the brains of the Philippine insurrection, Mabini, too weak to fight; Mabini in Manila, which is under the control of the American forces if there is any place which is; Mabini in prison, where one would think he could do no harm; Mabini paralyzed, but, in spite of all this, banished because he would not renounce his love of liberty and swear allegiance to the United States. Was there any fear that this paralytic could make forcible resistance to American authority? Was he banished lest he might escape from prison? No. He was banished because God's truth was on his lips, and because the administration feared the indignation of the civilized world over the hypocrisy masquerading in the name of American liberty. But this is not all. American soldiers are killing wounded and unresisting Filipino prisoners. Do you doubt it? Read the statistics cited by George Kennan in his papers written for the "Outlook." Remember that that religious periodical has been an administration organ, and that the President has had no more able defender than its editor, Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott.

The support which imperialism is receiving from vested interests and so-called Christian pulpits reminds one of a similar support given to the cause of slavery in the days of our fathers. Again I am reminded of Wendell Phillips. As he appealed, after John Brown's raid, "from the American people drunk with cotton, and the 'New York Observer,' to the American people fifty years hence," so may we appeal from the American people, drunk with the lust of conquest, and the "New York Outlook," to the American people when the light of history and civilization has at length made clear that militarism and democracy cannot abide together.

But the Spanish conquest of our Republican administration continues. We are now resorting to Spanish inquisitorial methods to compel silent prisoners to speak or reluctant witnesses to testify. An officer of our regular army, now serving in Luzon, has given in a letter details of the "water torture," which are too horrible to repeat. Gen-

eral Sherman was right when he said that "War is hell," but the war in which he fought was not disgraced by any such atrocities as those just related as taking place in the islands of the Pacific, until one may well exclaim: "O liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name."

The culmination of the conquest of the United States by Spain was reached the other day when the Filipino leader was made a prisoner. It has been truly said that war legalizes nearly every practice that is held in abhorrence by civilized men in time of peace. I am not sufficiently familiar with military tactics and military ethics to enable me to say whether forgery, which would land a civilian in the penitentiary, is approved by military regulations, and I shall not waste time in any criticism of the trickery and strategem by which Aguinaldo was deceived. Since coming into this hall I have been told by a gentleman on this platform of a remark made at dinner to-day by an American army officer to the effect that he was glad no West Point graduate had anything to do with the capture of Aguinaldo, which he regarded as a disgrace to American arms. It may be worth while to remember that of the capturing party five only were Americans, three were Tagalogs, and seventy-eight were Macabebes, who, as Colonel Codman has said, are now allies of the United States as they were formerly allies of Spain, and who, as Governor Boutwell has said, are savage mercenaries in the employ of our government. The report tells us that one of the Filipino traitors had been shot through the lungs in a recent battle in which he was taken prisoner. What threats of torture and punishment and what promises of reward induced these Filipino prisoners to turn traitors we can only guess. Until we know we cannot justly estimate their guilt. My desire is merely to call attention to the fact that it was not until the Spanish officer, apparently in command of the party, said: "Now, Macabebes, go for them!" that the Judas who betrayed Aguinaldo threw his arms about the leader and said: "You are a prisoner of the Americans." I take this from Funston's story of the capture, as printed in the daily papers. So it was by command of a Spanish officer that Aguinaldo was captured at last. This was the culmination of the conquest of the United States by Spain. What could be more pathetic than the statement in Funston's report that Aguinaldo dispatched supplies to the party, and directed kind treatment of the five Americans who were advancing to make him prisoner, and who,

he thought, were prisoners in the hands of his own men. We may be able to give points to the Filipinos on forgery and strategem, but they can give us points on the elementary and fundamental principles of Christianity. For my part, I would rather be the commander-in-chief of the Filipino forces, fighting for home and liberty and independence against great odds, and now at last a prisoner through strategem, than be the commander-in-chief of the American forces, sworn to uphold and defend the constitution of the United States, and now directing a war against the fundamental principles of human liberty. "If this be treason, make the most of it." My brethren are men of whatever color and in whatever place, who are fighting for liberty and self-government. My foes are they who betray the sacred principles to which our fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

The chairman of this meeting has alluded to the apathy ✓ of the American people on this great question. To my mind this is our greatest danger. If the President of the United States should boldly proclaim the empire, there is no doubt as to the answer of the people. / Imperialism is making progress among us, just as it did in ancient Rome, by gradual stages, and without any clear conception on the part of the people of the trend of affairs. Men who love their country as dearly as we do, and who hate tyranny as bitterly, cannot be persuaded that there is danger to our institutions from the forcible imposition upon an alien race of what they regard as a superior civilization. They cannot see that benevolent assimilation ✓ is as false in principle as criminal aggression. They think that if there be imperialism there must be an emperor, and, as they read the honeyed words of presidential papers, they can find no Cæsar in "the mildest mannered man that ever scuttled ship or cut a throat." But the essence of empire is absolutism. It makes no difference, so far as the existence of the empire is concerned, whether the absolute power is administered benevolently or malignantly, or whether it is wielded by one man or by many. Free government is by consent of the governed. Government without responsibility to the governed is imperial. It is in this sense that Governor Boutwell finds an empire already in existence in the Philippines, where the people have no voice, and where the President rules ten million souls by the strong arm of military force, and without any constitutional restraint. How thankful the American

people should be that this grand old man, Governor Boutwell, retains mental vigor and physical strength sufficient to enable him to do the work he is doing to-day. Great as were the services he rendered to this, his native State, and to the entire nation, in days gone by, he is doing his grandest work after he has passed his four-score years. My colleagues in Philadelphia bid me say that they are thankful for the inspiration of his example. To me he seems the Michael Angelo of American statesmen, bewailing the decay of his country's liberties, but doing all within his power to make that country's name illustrious. On one point, however, I beg leave to differ from Governor Boutwell. If I had my way, no one would call the McKinley party by the name Republican, a name hallowed by its association with the names of the great men who freed the slave and saved the Union. "No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent, — this is the leading principle, the sheet anchor of American republicanism." This is the definition of the word "republican" as made by Abraham Lincoln, and no man has a right to that party name who is false to that fundamental principle.

For my part I am not disposed to underestimate the strength of the forces against us. We are met just after the army bill has given the President absolute power over the Philippines, after the capture of the leader of the army of liberty, and when the war budget of our own nation is greater in amount than that of any of the military nations of the old world. Under these depressing circumstances there is the one supreme duty for us, and that is to make no compromise of American principles.

It has been said here this evening that the power of the United States is so tremendous as to leave no doubt of the ultimate outcome of this struggle. The Filipinos, it is said, must eventually yield to our force. If it is a mere question of brute strength, this is undoubtedly true. We have the soldiers and the ships and the guns and the money. We have the giant's strength and may use it like a giant. We can kill and torture and devastate, and then announce that the war is over. We can hold territory by force of arms and call it peace. That may all happen and yet the final victory may be with the Filipinos. "The race is not always to the swift, nor the battle to the strong." The long view gives the clearest vision. To his contemporaries there was never a greater failure than that of the Nazarene on the cross. I began

my remarks with a reference to Wendell Phillips, and it was he who said: "One, on God's side, is a majority." Let me leave with you in the present crisis those inspiring words of your poet, Lowell, which Phillips has quoted more than once within these walls:

" Right forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne
 But that scaffold sways the future, and, behind the dim unknown,
 Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own.
 We see dimly in the Present what is small and what is great,
 Slow of faith, how weak an arm may turn the iron helm of fate,
 But the soul is still oracular; amid the market's din,
 List the ominous stern whisper from the Delphic cave within, —
 They enslave their children's children who make compromise
 with sin."

SENOR SIXTO LOPEZ.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It would be impossible, in the time allotted to me, to attempt anything in the form of a complete statement of the cause of my countrymen. But it is natural that you should expect me to say something about the capture of Aguinaldo and the official and other reports which have recently come from the Philippines.

I am sorry that the gallant soldier who has led our people through the former insurrection and the present war, the man who never accepted a bribe and never offered one, and who, in the closing hour of his military career vindicated his own character from the charges of cruelty that have been made against him, by ordering that the supposed American prisoners should be treated kindly — I am sorry that he has been captured. But whilst I admit this sorrow, I believe that his capture will have a beneficial effect rather than a baneful one upon our cause generally. The defence of our rights and of our homes will continue with undiminished force, and Aguinaldo's mantle will fall upon one of the many excellent generals now in the field. Whether Aguinaldo be kept in prison, deported to Guam, or allowed to come to America, the people will remain faithful to him in his absence even more than in his presence. But what is of more importance still, they will be faithful to the aspirations for which he fought, and for which they will continue to fight.

From the reports which during the past month have come from the Philippines the uninformed reader might be led to infer that the "war was nearly over;" that actual progress is being made in the so-called "pacification of the islands;" and that the Filipinos are submitting to American sovereignty with a cheerful desire to obtain those constitutional rights which the Administration declares were never intended for its foreign subjects. But I think I shall be able to show you that the conditions are practically the same as heretofore, and that in so far as any of these reports are true they indicate not a real but only an apparent change.

It should be remembered that this is the dry season in the Philippines, during which the Filipino forces are least, and the American forces are most active. Every dry

season since the war began has had its accompaniment of optimistic predictions as to the war being at an end. But in order to discover whether any real progress is being made it is necessary to take the mean of results obtained during both the dry and the rainy season. Much, if not indeed all, that is now being done will be undone during the rainy season. This has occurred so often in the past as to entirely disprove the contention that "a thing once done cannot be undone!" It is better not to shout until one is out of the woods.

It should be noted, too, that every item or fact at all favorable to the policy of forcible subjugation is collected in most cases in a very exaggerated form, and transmitted with all possible speed to this country, whilst facts which tell in an opposite direction may not receive the same attention, and may have to wait for the slower process of delivery by mail. But allowing for all these advantages on the side of those who desire and who have need to make much out of little, these reports do not indicate a real change in the condition of affairs.

You are aware that quite recently a new and more rigorous system of warfare has been adopted in the Philippines. Instead of holding a large number of outposts and maintaining authority within rifle range, as has been stated, the American forces have been concentrated in certain places. By this means the capture or surrender of small bodies of Filipinos has resulted, but as against this the area of American occupation has been proportionally decreased, and the abandoned outposts have fallen into the hands of the Filipinos. This latter fact has not been telegraphed to America.

It is certainly a serious matter for the Filipinos to have some of their rifles captured, but on the other hand they frequently capture small convoys during the rainy season, and thus not only make good the loss but add to their supply of arms and ammunition. This is another fact not usually sent in telegraphic despatches. But the result in both of these cases leaves the condition of affairs practically what it was before.

Then again, you will notice that many of these reports recount the capture of "armed" Filipinos. This does not necessarily mean the capture of rifles. In some cases the reader has been left to infer that the whole of the captured force had been armed with rifles, whereas only a few of the number mentioned possessed these weapons. Other reports mention the capture or the surrender of so many

hundreds of "bolo-men." The latter word looks quite imposing in half-inch type. But it is not generally known in America that the bolo is a household and an agricultural implement, and that it is not a weapon, although it is often used as such with telling effect. Every farm laborer and house carpenter possesses and constantly carries with him the ever useful bolo. There is not a household in the Philippines that does not possess several bolos. The cost of the bolo is about fifty cents, but there are those "made in Germany" which can be had for half that amount. There are probably between two and three millions of "bolo-men" in our country engaged in peaceful pursuits.

It is therefore possible for the American forces to capture thousands of farm laborers who had never struck a blow for their country, but who would be described as "bolo-men," and who would thus serve the purpose of those who desire to chronicle brilliant military victories.

But it is also reported that numbers of Filipinos are taking the oath of allegiance. I have reason to believe that many of these Filipinos are made to do duty more than once in this process of pacification. They are first reported as having "surrendered;" later on they are reported to have "taken the oath of allegiance," and the reader is left to infer that these statements refer to two different lots of Filipinos. Some of those who have first "surrendered" and then "taken the oath" subsequently join the Federal Party and thus do duty a third time. But they soon get tired of American rule, and most of them secede during the rainy season. They are, perhaps, captured a second time, and are made to go through the whole treble process again. Many of them are musicians, and it is probable that some of these sextuply subdued Filipinos take a turn in the brass band when Judge Taft comes along to establish civil government, and thus do duty a seventh time. Surrendering is probably becoming a fine art and a profession in the Philippines. Whether it pays I know not, but it certainly supplies the means of making the most out of the smallest stock of material.

But seriously, the number of those who, under pressure or hardship, have taken the oath of so-called allegiance to a sovereignty which they outwardly accept but inwardly despise, forms a very small proportion of the ten millions of people who are openly opposed to foreign rule of any kind. It should be remembered that if these new and more rigorous methods of so-called "warfare" had been

put into operation at any time during the last two years the same or even a larger number could have been compelled to take the oath. But allegiance obtained under a threat of deportation or something worse is not allegiance at all; it is simply perjury at the point of the bayonet, and is no more morally binding than a signature to a cheque obtained by presenting a pistol at the head of the signer. The time, however, will come when those who have been compelled to take thus the oath will greatly outnumber the American forces and then the house of cards will once more tumble to the ground.

But there is a terribly tragic side to all of these reports. Very few persons in this country realize what it costs to obtain the enforced allegiance of even these few thousands of Filipinos. My lips are sealed in regard to this aspect of the question, but some day the truth will be known, and I can only pray that it will be known soon. In the meantime, or until a wiser or a juster policy is adopted, our people will have to continue to suffer. But let no one be deceived into the belief that permanent peace can be restored in the Philippines by force of arms, or by any other process however cruel or unjust. If cruelty could have subjugated the Filipinos they would have been subjugated ere this.

The establishment of civil government at a time when the American military forces are about to be increased, and when honest patriots like Mabini are being deported to Guam, ought, I think, to arouse your suspicion. Such civil government could have been established with a much greater show of success eighteen months ago. The brass band and the enthusiastic crowd ought not to be taken too seriously. Brass bands are cheap in the Philippines where music is so universal, and I have no doubt that much of the supposed enthusiasm is purposely indulged in by the people in order to throw dust in the eyes of those who are willing if not anxious to be deceived. But there is one important fact which the authorities have overlooked in their anxiety to do something which they fondly hope will satisfy the Filipinos. If this civil government is to be real; if it is not to be civil in name but military in fact; if it will give liberty of speech, and the right of association and petition, you will find that the Filipinos will make good use of these rights. Those who are now claiming that our people are illiterate and that a majority of them are in favor of American rule will soon discover that the Filipinos really can read and write, and that petitions in

favor of independence will be signed in every town and hamlet throughout the archipelago, including those of the "completely pacified" island of Panay. They will find that largely attended meetings in favor of independence will be held in the city of Manila itself, comprising those who have been compelled to temporarily submit to American authority. There will, indeed, be many surprises in store for those who are so anxious to establish civil government. The Filipinos being in favor of independence will require no brass bands, or oaths of allegiance, or coercion, or deportation, or military horrors to convert them to a belief in Filipino rule. I do not ask you to take my word for it, or the opinion of Judge Taft or General MacArthur. You have only to use your own common sense, and it will tell you that there is not a people in this world who would willingly submit to be governed by a foreign nation. You have only to ask yourselves, would you be satisfied with any government, however good, provided by a foreign master? You know that you would be prepared to suffer the same pain and horror that the Filipinos are now suffering, in order to keep your star-spangled banner in the heavens. The Filipinos resemble you in that one sentiment at least. As long as they retain their manhood and their self-respect they will never submit to a master, however good or benevolently inclined he may be.

Emblazoned upon your banner are the stars of freedom. We have chosen the sun as an emblem for our little flag, which is as dear to us as yours is to you. But if your stars ever float in undisputed sway in our sky it will be because our sun has set forever. May God protect us from such a calamity!

Mr. Chairman, as this is probably the last occasion for the present on which I shall address a public audience in America, I should like to take the opportunity of thanking the people of this country generally for the liberty which they have accorded to me in coming to plead the cause of my people. I beg, also, to thank the friends of freedom, both far and near, who are fighting in the cause of justice for your country as well as for mine. Especially do I thank the Anti-Imperialist Leagues in this country, the New England Anti-Imperialist League, to all of whom my countrymen will remain forever indebted. With your permission I should like to publicly thank Mr. Fiske Warren for the great assistance he has given, and will continue to give, our cause and our people. If I live until my hair is as white as his face I shall never forget his kindness to

me, and what he has done for my fellow-countrymen. I desire, also, to thank the press of this great country, and especially of this city, for its courtesy to me. And I cannot leave America without a word of farewell to those opponents, who, I regret to say are somewhat numerous, but who are decreasing every day. Some day I hope to return and be able to thank all the people of America for justice and for the recognition of the independence of the Philippine Republic.

THE HON. ROBERT M. MORSE.

THE present attitude of the administration towards Cuba is the latest development of the policy of aggression and conquest towards weak peoples, and of the denial of their right to be free which the President has been steadily pursuing for the last three years. If this policy did not originate with him it was early adopted by him, and he has followed it, now with seeming reluctance and now with open assertion, at one time claiming that he was driven to it by the pressure of circumstances and of public opinion, which could not be disregarded, and at another time exulting in the fact that he had effected these momentous changes, but always supporting it, always employing the enormous power at his command to throw down the ideals of a century, to reverse the policy under which our government was born and has flourished ; and to place us before the world as a great, vulgar, greedy nation, inflated with material prosperity and grabbing territory wherever it could be wrested from a weaker people, regardless in the selfish promotion of our material interests, of the rights of others, of the great names, the high standards, and the noble objects which have constituted the glory of the nation. What political party four years ago would have dared to proclaim that we could acquire territory for any other purpose than of eventually making it into states in which the inhabitants should be as free as ourselves, and should be entitled to the equal protection and benefits of the constitution, or that we should raise a great army and navy for purposes of conquest and aggrandizement? What power of eloquence or subtlety of reasoning would have then enabled any public man to convince the people that the Declaration of Independence was a series of glittering generalities, appropriate enough as the expression of the rights of the white inhabitants of the thirteen rebellious colonies one hundred and twenty-five years ago, but having no application to brown men or black men in these modern days, who are seeking in their own way and by their own lights and without injury or threat to any one else to work out their education, elevation, and independence? And yet to a large extent, that change has been effected. The power of the administration and of the in-

fluences, both political and commercial, which are allied with it, has been exerted in every direction to mould and control public opinion, and to silence opposition to its views and its purposes. The Democratic party, to its credit it may be said, has resolutely declared against this new policy, and here and there an independent press and an independent pulpit have spoken, but the machinery of the Republican party has been used with remorseless power to crush any questioning or objection, and a large part of the men claiming to be Christian clergymen have denied their professions, in upholding the killing of thousands who have done no wrong and against whom we have no just cause of complaint, the devastation of a country, the spoliation and destruction of property, the imprisonment and exile of patriots, the torturing of peaceful inhabitants, and the declaration to millions of people, who have been striving through centuries to be free, that they must surrender their hopes of independence or die.

It is idle to say that Providence or accident or destiny or any other cause outside of our own deliberate and wilful acts have brought about the present condition of things. There will always be two opinions as to whether we were justified in making war on Spain. That Spain had misgoverned Cuba and had treated the Cubans with cruelty and injustice cannot be doubted. That the Cubans were justified in rebelling cannot be doubted, but there is the highest authority for believing that the exercise of more consideration on our part would have accomplished within a short time and by peaceful methods the relinquishment by Spain of her claim of dominion. But the country had been lashed into fury by men, some of whom honestly believed that nothing but war could accomplish the desired result, and some of whom desired and intended that nothing but war should be allowed to result. The President threw off his assumed reluctance to engage in war, took the lead in urging a great appropriation which was intended and was understood to be a threat of war, sent a message to Spain, which no nation could receive without resenting — and the war came. Its declared purpose, the sole purpose which at that time could have enlisted general support, was to free Cuba from the yoke of Spain, and to enable its inhabitants to establish an independent government. It was a movement in the interest of humanity, so it was claimed, dictated by no selfish motives, with no thought of aggrandizement for ourselves, and with the express declaration that no portion of Cuban

territory, and, therefore, no portion of any territory, — for Cuba was then the only country whose territory it could be conceived was involved, — should be taken by us. The war quickly closed with the destruction of Spanish power in Cuba. Then was the time for our government, if it had been true to its professions, to have given the world the most splendid example of national disinterestedness recorded in history, and to have established a new standard for the conduct of nations, worthy of the Republic, by declaring in its treaty with Spain that, as it had entered upon the war solely to set free the Cubans, it would accept the withdrawal of Spain from Cuba as a satisfactory settlement. If our government had then taken that position it would have earned the undying gratitude of Cubans, of Porto Ricans, of Filipinos, of peoples in all parts of the world, who had looked to this country as the leader in every movement for the advance of humanity, and it would have given us the opportunity to aid these weak and struggling nations in establishing themselves, and to secure their permanent friendship. Such a course would have been consistent with our traditions and our professions; it would have involved no bloodshed, no devastation of homes, no violation of the rights and liberties of others, and even as a commercial venture it would have been the most profitable enterprise in which the country had ever engaged. We should have been saved the terrible record of the last two years, the enormous sacrifices of life and property, the necessity of a great army and navy, and the shattering of faith in the honesty and consistency of the American republic.

But the President willed it otherwise and he has gradually brought to his support a large portion, if not a majority, of the country. He instructed his Commissioners to demand of Spain the cession of Porto Rico and the Philippines, and in the tone of a despot he declared his purpose long before the treaty was ratified, to require the absolute subjection of the vast populations of those islands. He decreed that they should not be independent, that they should not cherish the hope at any time of being free, but that they must accept our supremacy, and trust to us to give them such rights and such degree of local self-government as we might judge proper. They could never hope to be citizens of the United States; they could not even expect to be free citizens of their own country. Their laws, their institutions, and their government must be made by us, and primarily to promote our interests.

In Porto Rico the inhabitants quietly submitted to this decree. They had believed the declarations of the general commanding our armies that the constitution of the United States would follow its flag, and that notwithstanding the terms of the treaty, they would be accorded the rights of American citizenship. But in the Philippines where the people, with the cordial approval of our representatives, naval, military, and civil, had practically achieved their independence, had destroyed or taken prisoners the Spanish armies, had established a government and held undisputed possession of Luzon, with the exception of the city of Manila, the announcement of the purpose of the President fell with astounding force. An alleged trespass across the American lines led to an attack by our armed forces upon the allies whom we had summoned and encouraged, and by whose sacrifices and services we had been aided; and although the patriot leader of the Filipinos apologized for the error of his subordinates and begged for a cessation of hostilities, our general replied that the war having begun must be prosecuted to the end, and his action was approved by the President. Since then, by the express direction of the President, the war has been conducted with remorseless and relentless fury. Tens of thousands have been killed, the young men, the valiant, the best and bravest of the Filipinos, their towns have been burned, their women and children have been driven without food or shelter into the morasses or the mountains, the jails have been filled to overflowing with political prisoners, their leaders, among them Mabini, a statesman worthy of any age or country, crippled through his opposition to Spanish cruelty, have been exiled, and now, all those methods failing to crush out the spirit of liberty for which these men are dying, the horrors of the reconcentrado system of Weyler, and tortures too dreadful to detail, have been employed by American soldiers carrying the flag of a free country. For whose benefit is all this wanton wicked waste of life and property? Not for the Filipinos. The universal testimony is that, throughout the islands, except where the people are under the immediate terror of our guns, there is devotion to their cause of independence and a determination not to submit to our control. For the benefit of the foreign residents and interests in Manila? There is no reason to believe that these were ever seriously imperilled. For the benefit of Americans? What Americans, except camp followers and speculators, will ever

venture into these tropical regions? But even if the islands possessed all the riches of mine and forest and agriculture which the most imaginative description has given us, and honest American emigrants would rush in to occupy them, what right have we to secure them by force? We are told that our government, after it has destroyed all opposition, will establish schools and seek to develop the capacity and intelligence of such of the inhabitants as it has not slaughtered. But does any one seriously suppose that seven millions of Asiatics can be taught the English language and English customs and can be made over into Anglo-Saxons? There is no precedent in history for such a belief; sooner or later we shall be compelled to admit that though our shot and shells, our prisons, and our tortures, can take lives and destroy houses and stores and the little savings of an humble, afflicted, and long-suffering people, it cannot kill the love of liberty or the hope of independence.

The advocates and supporters of the President's policy who have endeavored, with difficulty and doubts they must confess, to justify the unhappy conditions in the Philippines have, however, until lately consoled themselves by believing that the President would at least keep his promise to the Cubans. But the man who said that it was our plain duty to give free trade to the Porto Ricans and straightway imposed a tariff upon them without their consent, and who declared that forcible conquest was criminal aggression, and then entered upon a war of subjugation against the Philippines, might be depended upon in the fulness of time to break the solemn word by which the nation pledged independence to Cuba. Many people were credulous enough to believe that that word would be kept. But there have been indications almost from the beginning that the President and his most confidential advisers had no intention of permitting Cuba to go beyond our grasp, and that, by one course or another, events were to be so controlled that the Cubans should be compelled either to take refuge in annexation, or to make open opposition to our arms which would justify their forcible subjugation. The terms which the President has induced Congress to impose as the condition of our recognizing their independence are absolutely incompatible with their independence, and if acceded to will make them a vassal nation, deprived of the most important elements of sovereignty. This latest outrage on human rights is more, even, than some of the President's own supporters can tolerate, and it may be

that it will awaken men who up to the present have acquiesced in this rapid departure from our recognized principles of government.

It is well, therefore, for us here in Faneuil Hall to enter our solemn protest against this new doctrine of forcible conquest, and this denial of the rights of man.

Let us renew our vows to the cause of liberty and peace. Let us say again with Webster: "There is nothing that satisfies the human mind in an enlightened age unless man is governed by his own country and the institutions of his own government." Let us go back to the Declaration of Independence made by great men, not for one race and time, but for all races and for all ages, and remember what Lincoln said of them: "Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some men, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, or none but white men, or none but Anglo-Saxon white men, were entitled to liberty and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence, and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began . . . so that no man should thereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the principles on which the temple of liberty was being built."

THE REV. A. A. BERLE, D.D.

It is a triple cry of liberty which calls us together this evening, and without exaggeration there has probably been no more serious cause before the American people for judgment than that which is embodied in the rallying cry, Free America, Free Cuba, and Free Philippines. If at first glance this seems to be an alliterative trick for rhetorical effect, a more careful examination of the facts will soon convince us that, for once at least, the rhetoric of the rallying cry is the expression of a solemn and unmistakable alliance of thought and result, from which the mind cannot escape. For, ultimately, the preservation of a free America is bound up in the effort to keep and establish a free Cuba, and this in turn, if it is to be other than a mere jumbling of meaningless terms, must finally emerge in a free group of Philippine islands.

It is of the nature of the vocabulary of liberty, a vocabulary which we are in danger of losing, because the facts are becoming so dissonant with the natural meanings of the terms employed that its terms must mean the same things wherever they are used. It does not admit of artificial distinctions among the members of the human family. It has no distinctions of race or condition to sustain, nor any of civilization or religion to uphold. The vocabulary of human freedom, especially in the domain of political liberty, is the one vocabulary which means the same thing wherever applied. This is the great distinction which democracy has produced in the government of man. Imperialism in all its forms has, if I may so term it, that sliding scale of interpretation which can mean democracy in England, autocracy in India, aristocracy in Ireland, and plutocracy in South Africa. And these again have the grim and mobile power to change themselves easily and readily into eviction, rapine, despotism, and slaughter. If these are the possibilities of the most benign form of imperialism, and we have seen and are seeing them in operation at the present moment, we have before us the great and enduring contrast between democracy as represented by the American republic and the best imperialism that we can conceive to be possible. But the vocabulary of freedom admits of no such changes of interpretation. Genuine freedom means genuine freedom whether in Boston, Havana,

or Manila, and the lover of real freedom will never consent to a compromise nor even an interpretation of liberty which makes such a distinction in the slightest degree possible.

It has been since our Spanish war that we have begun as a people to think about the possibility of such a variable meaning of the terms of national freedom. A war begun, as I believe, under a tutelage whose condemnation posterity alone can adequately describe, "begotten in prejudice and nurtured in error," utilizing the generous sympathies of this great American people for personal and ignoble ends, started us in the downward course of imperialistic development, first of all by policy of equivocation and confusion in the meaning of the most sacred words of our national vocabulary. Liberation, instead of ringing true to the historic traditions of Washington and the mighty company of the forefathers who established the land and gave it institutions, and maintained by Lincoln, who reaffirmed with the blood of a million soldiers the correctness of the definitions of liberty which the fathers had written with the blood and toil of the Revolutionary campaigns, began to take on the aspect of equivocation and hesitation. The Declaration of Independence began to stick in the throat of those who represented the people of the United States in their national government.

The belief in the inherent right of men to be free began to assume the sinister aspect of menace to men whose hope of gain lay in the subjection of great tracts of land and great masses of human labor, for which they rendered no suitable equivalent themselves. The great maxims of liberty and the love of freedom began to disappear from the public documents of the nation, and in their place began a systematic presentation of the most cowardly flight from the elementary demands of morality and humanity that our land has ever seen. We began to hear of the amazing and most bewildering interference of Providence in the affairs of the Republic. We began to hear much of duty beyond the seas, while duty, I suppose, being beyond the seas, utterly disappeared at home. We began to hear that a mysterious and unbridled force called destiny was shoving us on in a career of rapine, bloodshed, and dishonor, and presented to the world the astounding spectacle of a free people beginning a war of liberation by calling on God to witness the rectitude of their intentions and ending it with persistent and shameless bloodshed in the carrying out of a Divine decree!

Never, in the history of a free people, in my judgment,

was the nomenclature of religion so basely misused, nor the religious attitude in times of turbulence and anxiety so fearfully and grossly caricatured. If liberty has suffered in this imperialistic development religion has suffered even more; if the doctrines of human rights have become obscured the ideas of the providence and overruling wisdom of God have for a generation, in many minds, become hopelessly eclipsed.

Nor has the loss of the appropriate and efficient use of the vocabulary of freedom been without its legitimate result. The forgetfulness of the people of the real meaning of these terms has led to their submission in the loss of the things which follow naturally in their train. Thus national documents affecting, not our course toward a foreign people, but our purposes toward ourselves, have been and are being systematically withheld from the public view, and thus escaping public criticism and judgment. There has never been a time of peace in the history of this republic, so far as I am aware, when so many documents vital to the formation of a mature and enlightened public opinion have been so steadily kept from the public as since the imperialistic course of our national government was entered upon. We have been assured that there is no war, or but very little war, in the Philippines, but nevertheless because of that little, our national government has withheld from us papers which a free people not only has the right to have submitted to its judgment, but which an elective executive cannot in honor keep from the people's sight. It is thus that despotism in the distant islands of the sea has produced its rapid and sure reaction in despotism and the practice of militarism at home. It is thus that free Philippines are inseparably linked with free America and free Cuba. It is thus that these three particular phases of the liberty question are not really three, but one. And far more serious now, even than the cessation of the slaughter in the Philippine islands, is the creation of a public opinion which sees the danger of our institutions at home. Never in my judgment was the vocabulary of the Revolutionary patriots more appropriate in the lips of truth-loving Americans than now. Never was there such an appeal for the spirit of the men who laid the foundations of the American republic. A greater humanity than theirs waits upon the issues now deciding. A greater morality, because more comprehensive than theirs, in sweep and ethical possibility, calls for the swift and persistent resistance of American

patriots to the imperialistic movement. If Hancock and Otis and Adams were right we are, if possible, more right. Because while the liberty tree of the forefathers was a slender sapling, affording only precarious protection from the raging storms of world rapine and ravage, we are set to protect a mighty oak which has sheltered millions already and should shelter millions more.

Out of the attitude of equivocation came the mighty lust for possession and conquest. Out of the passionate greed for power and possession came a new fertility in ethical jugglery. Peace and pacification, for example, have become among the bloodiest words in our recent history. It is the business of pacification that has made thirty thousand graves in the Philippine Islands. It is pacification that has burned homes and wiped whole villages from the face of the earth. It is pacification that is now going on, in the battle between honor and uprightness and private interest in the struggle for a free Cuba. And as it is in the nature of liberty to maintain its essential integrity wherever the conception is born, so it is in the nature of war and slaughter to grow wherever they have once been begun. We have sent our young soldiers to those distant islands and have indoctrinated them into a series of lessons in rapine, ravage, and debauchery which has not been equalled in American history. We have led the army of the United States into campaigns from which the very men behind the guns have shrunk until, deluged in blood and corrupted by the very horrors in which they were engaged, they have become lost to the finer sense of Americanism which we supposed impregnably planted in their breasts. "We never knew these traits were in our boy," pathetically writes a father on reading the bloody letter which his debauched son, lusty for blood and delighting in slaughter, writes to him at home. Nor can we wonder, when Duty has changed his national banner into a blood-red rag and the Christian gospel has become Mohammedanized into glory and slaughter of the infidel as the surest method of winning the approval of Providence! This is the sorest infliction of all, that the very core of our humanity is thus corrupted and a silent or confused clergy join with a maddened and blood-spattered army in glorifying the achievements of the field, where blood and fire and rapine are the outstanding features of the horrifying spectacle. We must rescue America from these things and we must free the Philippines and free Cuba because the freedom of America ultimately allied inseparably to its moral and

religious sense holds not only the political but the religious future of so large a part of the world in its hands. Duty must be made to mean what it meant before this orgy of faith-breaking and promise-breaking began. Destiny must mean honorable effort to bring living and active duty into the common relations of men and nations. And Providence must be made again to signify not a monstrous deity hurrying men into bloodshed and slaughter, but a restraining God whom even a pre-Christian prophet presented as moderating and restraining the passions and desires of the human race that "the bruised reed will he not break and the smoking flax will he not quench." That even the rush-lights of human hopes and freedom are as dear to Him as the mightiest beacons from which life and liberty have blazed out upon a darkened world.

This confusion of the public mind and this policy of equivocation and treachery has been the golden opportunity for plutocracy and political corruption to perfect and exploit its schemes for plunder and personal gain. Leading the American public to the top of the mountain, imperialism has shown them the kingdoms of the world and has said to them, all these will I give thee if thou wilt but fall down and worship me. It was a liar who uttered the temptation originally; it is the versatile brood of the Father of Lies that keeps on repeating it. The policy of blood yields only blood. And if a blood-stained David was not permitted to build a temple to Jehovah we may be sure that no blood-bedraggled McKinley will give us a New and Greater America. The secure foundations of a sound national life are bedded in justice and justice alone. And the swift telegraph and cable, however long censored and withheld, will bring to us the truth, and the truth only can make us free. There has never in my judgment been a moment in the whole fearful Philippine war that a single American interest worthy the name would have suffered one jot if the hostilities had been instantly brought to a close, and a congress of Filipinos called, as we have called a congress of the Cubans. And there will be no peace till such a step is taken and the liberated telegraph makes it possible for the Filipino people and the American people to come face to face. In that interchange of a public opinion, which is not based upon falsehood and misrepresentation nor maintained by greed and lust of money, with a public opinion which desires only freedom sufficient to work out its own salvation, there will come the right solution of our grave and trying calam-

ities. It is toward this end that we must steadily strive. It is for this result that we must steadily labor. We shall not be discouraged and we shall ultimately triumph. Truth has often been on the scaffold before while triumphant Error was on the throne. But the years of God are God's and Truth's. America will remain free. And because America is free, Cuba and the Philippines shall be free also.

Since the above was written has come the news of the capture and taking of the allegiance oath by Aguinaldo. The precise terms and agreement under which this oath was taken and what the plans and purpose of the Administration with respect to the same are, no man can yet tell, probably not even the Administration itself. The habit of equivocation and vacillation is so strongly fixed among our imperialistic rulers that plain duty one day may become plain villainy the next. It is rather a happy sign that they find the way of the imperialistic transgressor rather hard. But the fact of Aguinaldo's capture and oath in no degree invalidate nor modify what I have written above. The imperialistic course is just as false, just as untrue to the ideals of the American nation-builders, and just as alien to any true and enduring conception of liberty, whether Aguinaldo surrenders, is captured, swears allegiance, or is hanged. Liberty, as I may again remark, is not a matter that is affected by accidents of condition or acts of persons. Benedict Arnold's treason did not change a hair's breadth the course of our forefathers. The Mexican war, remembered as a blot on the good name of our country, has not changed in its character because Texas and the added territory have prospered under American rule. If Cuba is annexed or otherwise stolen from its rightful owners, the facts which are true concerning this nation's solemn pledge will not be altered one jot. The very gospel of Christ itself has habitually to undergo just such trials; and probably more shameless things have been done in the name of religion, especially of the Christian religion, than we can, in our mild-mannered age, imagine. But the facts of Christ's gospel have never been invalidated thereby; only a stronger contrast has been made between that gospel and those who misrepresent it. My firm and unalterable conviction about the whole business is that the nation will rue it and repudiate it; that our sons and grandsons will feel about Cuba and the Philippines as we feel about the Indians and the Mexican war; that as we blush for our

century of dishonor in connection with the red man, so they will weep for the thousands of slain Filipinos, and will help to erect statues to the fallen martyrs of liberty in those far-away islands. I see a distant generation pausing before a bronze figure of the gifted Mabini, and telling the story of how he made the president of Cornell University blush and stammer when he was brought face to face with the Declaration of Independence contrasted with the burning homes and wanton slaughter of helpless Filipinos; I see men in whose veins shall flow the blood of the heroes of South Africa, linking in glorious union the names of the fallen sons with those of our hapless victims of the lust of imperialism in the Philippine Islands. They will be free then, and there will be peace and plenty in the land. And the peoples of the world will wonder that a great people like ours could think so majestic an ideal into the world and abuse it so mercilessly. Brutalism and blood will have vanished before a larger practice of humanity, and brotherhood and wars will be no more. But till that day dawns the friends of liberty will toil and struggle on, and the loss of no man, the surrender of many, and the abandonment of liberty by many more, will not swerve them from the true end of liberty: a Parliament of Man, a Federation of the World.

LETTERS.

THE following letters were received by the Secretary :

HAVANA, March 10, 1901.

We are in receipt of telegrams from all over the Island, sent by political organizations, municipalities, and individuals, all expressing the same sentiments, which may be summed up as follows :

The people of Cuba, while they have lost all confidence in the administration's declaration concerning Cuba's liberty, have never lost faith in the generosity and integrity of the American nation. We have known that political schemers were attempting to bring about such legislative measures as would enable them to appropriate whatever they most desired ; that the chicanery indulged in was not known to the majority we are fully aware, as we are confident that had Washington announced its intention to repudiate the Teller resolution the people of the United States would long since have protested so vigorously and forcibly that Congress would never have dared contemplate such a measure as the Platt amendment.

Our position from the first has been that of a people who recognized its own inability to resent what a more powerful nation would never have tolerated. We Cubans never asked the United States for anything more than recognition of our belligerent rights, which recognition was refused us in the most positive manner. We never asked for intervention, and we know perfectly well that it would never have been brought about had the " Maine " not been destroyed in Havana Harbor, or had Spain agreed to pay an indemnity or even manifested a spirit of apology.

When the war terminated we accepted establishment of a military government and urged our soldiers to deliver their arms to the American authorities, placing ourselves completely in the hands and at the mercy of the nation which had driven Spain from our territory, after calling men and angels to witness that its action was prompted

by purely unselfish and humane motives, and that the United States intended to exercise no "*jurisdiction, sovereignty, or control over Cuba.*" (See Teller resolution, April 19, 1898.)

The sentiment of Cubans toward Americans during the early part of 1899 can best be attested by those Americans who were here at the time; who saw American flags at every turn; who saw Cubans take the part of Americans in each of the frequent riots between the latter and the Spanish soldiery; who saw American soldiers received with open arms wherever they went; who saw the leading Cuban families — too unfamiliar with your national characteristics to discriminate between classes — offer the hospitality of their homes to every one announcing himself as American; who saw the cordiality and good-fellowship manifested at the dinners, balls, and receptions which were participated in almost daily by all residents of and visitors to Havana.

✓ We feel to-day precisely as we did then toward Americans. Our sentiment toward American politicians and the reliance to be placed in administration promises has been completely altered by the administration's own policy. Over two years of sickening delay, wanton disregard of our wishes and interests, culminating with the ✓ Congressional declaration that the Teller resolution was never meant to be kept, have caused us to feel rather disheartened.

✓ We recognize our own powerlessness to resent except by silent and spoken protest. You are in power; your forces occupy our territory; your representatives have for over two years done as they pleased with our ✓ finances; your soldiers guard the voluntarily surrendered arms with which we fought against Spain for three years before you came to our assistance, and the generosity of the American people who assisted us secretly in our war with Spain could not be called upon for similar aid against Federal forces.

✓ After all administration promises we are told that we must yield to the United States all *jurisdiction, sovereignty, and control* over affairs, and, in addition, we must give up territory to the disinterested United States.

At the end of your own Revolutionary War France requested of you certain concessions as demonstrations of your gratitude. You refused to comply. Yet France did not demand the privilege of maintaining a permanent naval station in New York or any other harbor.

The foregoing is a concrete statement of what is being said and written every day. That the people of the United States have been deliberately misled is apparent to every one on the ground. The sentiment at large is one of bitter, scornful indignation. In this the Spaniards share fully, and are just as outspoken as the Cubans. I will give you two examples. The "Diario de la Marina," ultra Spanish organ of the ultra conservative Spaniards, on receipt of the Platt amendment declared :

"The measure is an outrage. When asked for our purse at the point of a pistol we must surrender it, because by force one may be lynched, but it is expecting too much to ask us to say we wish our purses taken from us."

The "Union Espanola," another radical Spanish organ, editorially states :

"We, who yesterday condemned the Cuban who raised his voice in rebellion against the mother country, to-day experience nothing but sorrow and sympathy for our own brother people. Before everything we are Latin, and we shall resist with all our power any attempt to eradicate from Cuba the stamp of our nationality."

The two utterances are most significant. They denote the alteration which has come about in the minds of the people who were at first our best friends. The two papers mentioned were ardent upholders of an annexation policy. They urged Cubans to consider the advisability of coming under the protection of the United States as an integral part thereof.

Facts about Cuba have been systematically suppressed or distorted, and I speak in the name of my paper and of the Cuban people in thanking you for placing before the public the truth as to local conditions and ideas, and the actual situation. Believe me,

Very sincerely yours,

EDWIN WARREN GUYOL,
Editor "La Lucha."

NEW HAVEN, March 19, 1901.

I regret very much that my engagements here are such that I cannot go to Boston on the 30th. My own point of view in regard to expansion and imperialism is that they are against the interests of the people of the United States. I was very earnestly opposed to the war with Spain, primarily because there was no true cause of war ;

the United States had no grievance and no interest; secondarily, because my judgment was that the adventure was sure to entangle us in obligations and difficulties. The resolutions and declarations about "criminal aggression" and no conquest of Cuba seemed to me idle and foolish, because we were sure to take Cuba, and such declarations could serve no purpose except to be quoted against us and make us ridiculous as well as criminal in the end. Congress closed its recent session by uttering an ultimatum to the Cubans. If this is not "criminal aggression" what is? If we had conquered Cuba as an enemy in arms how else could we have acted to her?

I do not believe in the statesmanship which proceeds by issuing ultimatums to the other party. This is a world in which it is never safe for the biggest and strongest to swagger about with too much indifference to the rights and feelings of others. The lines of action on which we are advancing are those on which problems are sure to multiply against us. Our enemies and those who fear us may well rejoice to see us getting our hands so full of trouble of our own making that we shall be unable to interfere with them. People seem to think that a little war once in a while with a contemptible enemy is great fun. I believe that such a war is a great danger to ourselves. I do not mean to express dissent from others who feel more strongly the wrongs suffered by the Cubans and Filipinos from our action, but my own point of view is that of the interest of our own people. I regret to see what we are losing or throwing away of our own institutions and traditions, and I cannot watch the change in the temper and character of our own people without apprehensions about our national prosperity and stability.

Yours very truly,

W. G. SUMNER.

BOSTON, MASS., March 30, 1901.

I find it impossible to attend the meeting at Faneuil Hall to-night, and very much regret it. I hope the position will be made clear that the capture of Aguinaldo, or indeed the collapse of the war, cannot change our purpose nor our objection to the policy of the administration. The United States should not assume the government of the Philippine islands with or without force, with or without the consent of the people. Let each people work

out its salvation in its own way. America for the Americans, the Philippines for the Filipinos, and Cuba for the Cubans.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK A. COLLINS.

WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, March 19, 1901.

It would give me great pleasure to attend the meeting which is to be held in Faneuil Hall on the evening of the 30th instant, but it now seems probable that I shall not return to Massachusetts until about the first of May. I am glad the meeting is to be held, and I hope the speakers will portray in its true colors the policy of the present administration toward the Filipino and Cuban people. The brutal and bloody warfare which is being carried on in the Philippines against a brave and liberty-loving people is well supplemented by the recent perfidious betrayal of the Cubans, to whom the most sacred pledges of untrammelled self-government had been given by the American Congress. Would to God that there might be a great uprising of the honest and patriotic citizenship of our country to rescue the Republic from the hands of its worst enemies, the men who utter pious platitudes while they rob and murder the poor and defenceless, who are sacrificing the young manhood of the country on the altar of aggression and greed, who are making the country's flag the emblem of treachery, injustice, and despotism.

Respectfully yours,

ALBION A. PERRY.

MARION, MASS., March 29, 1901.

I regret that I cannot be present on Saturday night to hear the protest which is to be made against our breaking faith with Cuba, and against our continuing the war in the Philippines.

The promise made to Cuba and to the world that the United States would not attempt to control that island, but would instead give her her independence, was made by the chosen representatives of the people. ✓

As the representatives of the people their promise is binding upon the people, and if it is now broken it will not only be our national honor which will suffer, but the private honor of every man in this country.

When I was in Cuba during the Cuban-Spanish war I witnessed the sacrifices which the Cubans were willing to make for the sake of their future independence. I saw their homes burned, their wives and children herded in such numbers in the towns that they lay in the open streets and plazas dying of fever and starvation by the thousand, and I saw the men of Cuba shot against stone walls because they had dared to fight for their freedom.

When I remember these scenes and that these sacrifices were made by the Cubans to obtain the rights of self-government, I must be one of those who protest that the United States shall not take that right from them. If she does, then, not only the hundred thousand Cubans who gave their lives for liberty, but the thousands of our own young men who died of fever at Montauk Point and at Camp Alger, and who were killed in battle at San Juan, have given their lives in vain.

I am, Sir, sincerely yours,

RICHARD HARDING DAVIS.

WASHINGTON, March 15, 1901.

I have just received your favor of the 13th, forwarded from Winchester. I do not expect to return home until about May 1, and so will not be able to attend the meeting which is to be held concerning Cuba. I have been hoping that I might be able to go to Cuba this spring, but I fear I shall be unable to do so. What a great loss the country has suffered in the death of President Harrison! He really delivered the great message of his life within the last four months.

Sincerely yours,

S. W. McCALL.

Boston, March 29, 1901.

I have an engagement Saturday night which will prevent my being present at the meeting at Faneuil Hall, in which I feel a very great deal of interest. I wish there were some way by which an expression from our people could be secured on this imperial policy. I feel, like many thousand others similarly situated, that no opportunity has been yet presented. . . .

I wish our organization could circulate a paper among the more important men of our city, and thus secure an

expression of opinion on this great issue, for as far as I have been able to observe, at least nine out of ten of the thinking men are opposed to our present policy.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN GINN.

CHICAGO, March 28, 1901.

I ought to have advised you sooner that it will be impossible for me to be present at the meeting to be held at Faneuil Hall on the 30th inst. Please to send me the fullest possible report of the meeting. I shall be glad to see Mr. Boutwell's review. The reported capture of Aguinaldo will add a dramatic interest to the occasion. The contrast that may be drawn between the time when Aguinaldo was taken back to the islands by direction of Admiral Dewey on an American war vessel, and his capture by the dastardly treachery of natives bribed to that end by American gold, is striking and discreditable to the United States.

Yours very truly,

EDWIN BURRITT SMITH.









LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 010 455 440 4

